arXiv:0909.2387v1 [math.NT] 13 Sep 2009

On the transcendence of some infinite sums

Pingzhi Yuan* Juan Li

Abstract

In this paper we investigate the infinite convergent sum $T = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{P(n)}{Q(n)}$, where $P(x) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[x]$, $Q(x) \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ and $Q(x)$ has only simple rational zeros. N. Saradha and R. Tijdeman have obtained sufficient and necessary conditions for the transcendence of T if the degree of $Q(x)$ is 3. In this paper we give sufficient and necessary conditions for the transcendence of T if the degree of $Q(x)$ is 4 and $Q(x)$ is reduced.

Key words: Transcendental numbers, algebraic numbers, infinite sums

MCS: primary 11J81; secondary 11J86,11J91

1 Introduction

In this paper we will investigate the transcendence of the infinite convergent sum

$$T = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{P(n)}{Q(n)},$$

where $P(x) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[x]$, $Q(x) \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ and $Q(x)$ has only simple rational zeros. Owing to the reduction procedure described in Tijdeman [10, 11], we have

$$T = A + S, \quad S = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(n)}{n},$$

where $A \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, we take $q > 1$ to be a positive integer and $f(x)$ is a number theoretic function which is periodic mod q with $\sum_{i=1}^{q} f(i) = 0$, which we will assume throughout the paper.

About forty years ago, Chowla [4] and Erdős (see [7]) formulated some conjectures related to whether there exists a rational-valued function $f(n)$ periodic with prime period p such that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(n)}{n} = 0$. One of the conjectures was proved by Baker, Birch and Wirsing [3] in 1973. They used Baker's theory on linear

---

[0] $*$ This author is responsible for communications, and supported by the Guangdong Provincial Natural Science Foundation (No. 8151027501000114) and NSF of China (No. 10571180).

forms in logarithms to establish that $S \neq 0$ if $f(n)$ is a non-vanishing function defined on the integers with rational values and period q such that

i) $f(r) = 0,$ if $1 < \gcd(r, q) < q,$

ii) the cyclotomic polynomial Φ_q is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}(f(1), \cdots, f(q))$.

They further showed that their result would be false if i) or ii) is omitted (see [3]).

In 1982, T. Okada [8] established a result which provides a description of all functions for which ii) holds and $S = 0$. Okada's proof depends on the basic result on the linear independence of the logarithms of algebraic numbers and on the non-vanishing of $L(1, \chi) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\chi(n)}{n}$ if χ is a non-principal Dirichlet character. The precise result is stated in Section 2.

In 2001, S.D. Adhikari, N. Saradha, T.N. Shorey and R. Tijdeman [2] proved that if $S \neq 0$, then S is transcendental. They used this result to prove that if $P(x) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[x]$ and $Q(x) \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$, where $Q(x)$ is a polynomial with simple rational roots which are all in the interval $[-1, 0)$, then the infinite convergent sum $T = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{P(n)}{Q(n)}$ is 0 or transcendental. Further, if $Q(x)$ is a polynomial with simple rational roots, then T is a computable rational number or a transcendental number. For more information on the developments sketched above we refer to [1] and [10, 11]. In particular, if the degree of $Q(x)$ is 2, then

$$T = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha}{(qn + s_1)(qn + s_2)}$$

with $q,\ s_1,\ s_2$ integers, $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ nonzero, is transcendental if and only if $s_1 \not\equiv s_2 \pmod{q}$. On the other hand, by above results, it is easy to see that

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(3n + 1)(3n + 2)(3n + 3)} > 0$$

and

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(n + 1)(2n + 1)(4n + 1)} = \frac{\pi}{3}$$

are transcendental. The second equality was also proven by Lehmer [6] in 1975.

In 2003, N. Saradha and R. Tijdeman [9] rephrased Okada's theorem so that it becomes a decomposition lemma and gave sufficient and necessary conditions for the transcendence of $T = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{P(n)}{Q(n)}$ if the degree of $Q(x)$ is 3. They proved that

$$T = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha n + \beta}{(qn + s_1)(qn + s_2)(qn + s_3)}$$

is transcendental if s_1, s_2, s_3 are not in the same residue class mod q. However, when the degree of $Q(x)$ is 4, the example

$$T = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{16n^2 + 12n - 1}{(4n + 1)(4n + 2)(4n + 3)(4n + 4)} = 0$$

shows that the corresponding result is not valid.

The main purpose of the present paper is to give sufficient and necessary conditions for the transcendence of T if the degree of $Q(x)$ is 4, that is

$$T=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{\alpha n^2+\beta n+\gamma}{(qn+s_1)(qn+s_2)(qn+s_3)(qn+s_4)} \tag{1}$$

where $\alpha,\beta,\gamma\in\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, s_1,s_2,s_3,s_4 are distinct integers. By the reduction procedure described in Tijdeman [10, 11], without loss of generality, we may assume that $0<s_1,s_2,s_3,s_4\le q$, $\gcd(\alpha x^2+\beta x+\gamma,(qx+s_1)(qx+s_2)(qx+s_3)(qx+s_4))=1$ and $\gcd(s_1,s_2,s_3,s_4,q)=1$ throughout the paper. The following simple example shows how the reduction procedure works,

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{(2n+1)(2n+2)(2n+3)}=-\frac{1}{2}+\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\{\frac{1}{2n+1}-\frac{1}{2n+2}\}=-\frac{1}{2}+\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{(2n+1)(2n+2)}.$$

In Section 2 we shall give some preliminaries that will be useful for our further discussions. In Section 3 we prove the following Theorem.

Theorem 1.1 *Let*

$$T=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{\alpha n^2+\beta n+\gamma}{(qn+s_1)(qn+s_2)(qn+s_3)(qn+s_4)}$$

where s_1,s_2,s_3,s_4 *are distinct positive integers* $\le q$ *and* $\alpha,\beta,\gamma\in\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$. *Suppose* $\gcd(\alpha x^2+\beta x+\gamma,(qx+s_1)(qx+s_2)(qx+s_3)(qx+s_4))=1$, $\gcd(s_1,s_2,s_3,s_4,q)=1$ *and* Φ_q *is irreducible over* $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)$. *Then* T *is transcendental except when*

$$T=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{16n^2+12n-1}{(4n+1)(4n+2)(4n+3)(4n+4)}=0 \tag{2}$$

or

$$T=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{36n^2+36n-1}{(6n+1)(6n+2)(6n+4)(6n+5)}=0. \tag{3}$$

2 Preliminaries

In this section we shall introduce some notations and state the related results that will be needed in the sequel. We denote by $\varphi(n)$ the Euler function and P the set of all primes dividing q. We call the polynomial $Q(x)$ reduced if $Q(x)\in\mathbb{Q}[x]$ and it has only simple rational zeros which are all in the interval $[-1,0)$. We denote by $v_p(n)$ the exponent to which $p|n$ for any prime p and $n\in\mathbb{Z}$. We write

$$J=\{a\in\mathbb{Z}\mid 1\le a\le q,\ \gcd(a,q)=1\},$$

$$L = \{r \in \mathbb{Z} \mid 1 \leq r \leq q,\ 1 < \gcd(r,q) < q\},$$

and

$$L^{'} = L \cup \{q\}.$$

For $p \in P$ and $r \in L^{'}$, we define

$$P(r) = \{p \in P \mid v_p(r) \geq v_p(q)\}$$

and

$$\varepsilon(r,p) = \begin{cases} v_p(q) + \frac{1}{p-1}, & p \in P(r), \\ v_p(r), & \text{otherwise .} \end{cases}$$

For $r \in L^{'}$ and $a \in J$, we define

$$A(r,a) = \frac{1}{\gcd(r,q)} \prod_{p \in P(r)} (1 - \frac{1}{p^{\varphi(q)}})^{-1} \sum_{n \in S(r)} \frac{\sigma(r,a,n)}{n},$$

where

$$S(r) = \{ \prod_{p \in P(r)} p^{\alpha(p)} \mid 0 \leq \alpha(p) < \varphi(q)\}$$

and

$$\sigma(r,a,n) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if} \quad r \equiv an \gcd(r,q) \pmod q, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise .} \end{cases}$$

Theorem A. (Okada [8]). *If Φ_q is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}(f(1), \cdots, f(q))$, then $S = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(n)}{n} = 0$ if and only if*

$$f(a) + \sum_{r \in L} f(r)A(r,a) + \frac{f(q)}{\varphi(q)} = 0, \qquad \textit{for all } a \in J, \tag{4}$$

and

$$\sum_{r \in L'} f(r)\varepsilon(r,p) = 0, \qquad \textit{for all } p \in P. \tag{5}$$

N. Saradha and R. Tijdeman [9] estabished an equivalent version of Theorem A.

Lemma 2.1 (Decomposition Lemma [9]). *Let Φ_q be irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}(f(1), \cdots, f(q))$. Let M be the set of positive integers which are composed of prime factors of q. Then $S = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(n)}{n} = 0$ if and only if*

$$\sum_{m \in M} \frac{f(am)}{m} = 0, \qquad \textit{for all } a \in J, \tag{6}$$

and

$$\sum_{r\in L'} f(r)\varepsilon(r,p) = 0, \qquad \textit{for all } p \in P.$$

As a consequence of Lemma 2.1, they derived the following result.

Lemma 2.2 ([9]) *Let Φ_q be irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}(f(1),\cdots,f(q))$. Suppose $S = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{f(n)}{n} = 0$. Then*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{f(kn)}{n} = 0, \ \textit{for every } k \textit{ with } \gcd(k,q)=1.$$

The following result given by S.D. Adhikari, N. Saradha, T.N. Shorey and R. Tijdeman [2] is essential for the transcendence of $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{P(n)}{Q(n)}$.

Theorem B. ([2]) *Let $P(x) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[x]$, and let $Q(x) \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ be reduced. If*

$$T = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{P(n)}{Q(n)}$$

converges, then T is 0 or transcendental.

When the degree of $Q(x)$ is 3, N. Saradha and R. Tijdeman [9] obtained necessary and sufficient conditions for the transcendence of $T = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{P(n)}{Q(n)}$.

Theorem C. ([9]) *Let $T = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{\alpha n+\beta}{(qn+s_1)(qn+s_2)(qn+s_3)}$, where $\alpha,\ \beta \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, and $|\alpha|+|\beta|>0$. Let Φ_q be irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha,\beta)$ and s_1,s_2,s_3 be distinct integers such that $qn+s_1,\ qn+s_2,\ qn+s_3$ do not vanish for $n \geq 0$. Assume that s_1,s_2,s_3 are not in the same residue class $\bmod q$. Further let $s_1 \not\equiv s_2 \pmod q$ if $\alpha s_3 = \beta q$; $s_1 \not\equiv s_3 \pmod q$ if $\alpha s_2 = \beta q$; $s_2 \not\equiv s_3 \pmod q$ if $\alpha s_1 = \beta q$. Then T is transcendental.*

The following result in [5] will be useful in Section 3. For the convenience of the reader, we provide the sketch of a proof suggested by Frazer Jarvis.

Lemma 2.3 *Let $n, d,$ and r be integers such that $n>1$, $d>0$, $d|n$, and $\gcd(r,d)=1$, then there are precisely $\varphi(n)/\varphi(d) \geq \varphi(n/d)$ numbers which are coprime to n in the set $S=\{r+td, t=1,2,\cdots,\frac{n}{d}\}$.*

Proof. For primes $p|d$ there is no condition, but for primes $p|n$ but $p \not| d$, the congruence classes for $r+td$ are equally distributed mod p, so that $\frac{p-1}{p}$ of the possible numbers are prime to p. The Chinese Remainder Theorem gives an independence result. Since there are $\frac{n}{d}$ numbers considered, the number we seek is

$$\frac{n}{d}\cdot\prod_{p|n,p\not|d}(1-\frac{1}{p}),$$

and the result easily follows. □

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Let

$$T=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{\alpha_k n^k+\alpha_{k-1}n^{k-1}+\cdots+\alpha_0}{(qn+r_1)\cdots(qn+r_m)},$$

where $\alpha_0,\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_k\in\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, $r_1,\cdots,r_m$ are distinct positive integers and $k\le m-2$. Our main purpose is to consider the transcendence of T. By the reduction procedure given in Tijdeman [10, 11], we may restrict ourselves to the case that

i) $r_1,\cdots,r_m$ are distinct positive integers $\le q$, $\gcd(r_1,\cdots,r_m,q)=1$,

ii) $\gcd(\alpha_k x^k+\alpha_{k-1}x^{k-1}+\cdots+\alpha_0,(qx+r_1)\cdots(qx+r_m))=1$.

Therefore we need only consider the case $T=0$ by Theorem B, which we shall assume from now on. By partial fractions, we get

$$T=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\{\frac{A_1}{qn+r_1}+\frac{A_2}{qn+r_2}+\cdots+\frac{A_m}{qn+r_m}\},$$

where $A_1,\cdots,A_m\in\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_0,\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_k)$ are all nonzero numbers with

$$A_1+A_2+\cdots+A_m=0.$$

We define $f(n)$ for $n\ge 0$ as follows:

$$f(n)=\begin{cases}A_1, & n\equiv r_1 \pmod{q},\\ \cdots & \cdots\\ A_m, & n\equiv r_m \pmod{q},\\ 0, & \text{otherwise .}\end{cases}$$

Then $f(n)$ is a periodic function with period q taking only m non-zero values $f(r_1),f(r_2),\cdots,f(r_m)$ with

$$f(r_1)+f(r_2)+\cdots+f(r_m)=0$$

and

$$T=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{f(n)}{n}=0.$$

It is easy to see that $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_0,\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_k)=\mathbb{Q}(A_1,A_2,\cdots,A_m)$. If Φ_q is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_0,\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_k)$, then Φ_q is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}(f(1),\cdots,f(q))$, so (4), (5) and (6) are valid by Theorem A and Lemma 2.1. We have

Proposition 3.1 *Suppose*

$$T=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{\alpha_k n^k+\alpha_{k-1}n^{k-1}+\cdots+\alpha_0}{(qn+r_1)\cdots(qn+r_m)}=0,$$

where $r_1, \cdots, r_m$ *are distinct positive integers* $\leq q$, $k \leq m-2$, *and* $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$. *Suppose* $\gcd(r_1, \cdots, r_m, q) = 1$, *and* $\gcd(\alpha_k x^k + \alpha_{k-1} x^{k-1} + \cdots + \alpha_0, (qx + r_1) \cdots (qx + r_m)) = 1$ *and* Φ_q *is irreducible over* $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_0, \cdots, \alpha_k)$. *Then there exists an* r_i *with* $1 \leq i \leq m$ *such that* $\gcd(r_i, q) > 1$.

Proof. By the above arguments, if all of $\{r_1, \cdots, r_m\}$ are coprime to q, then $f(r) = 0$ for all $r \in L^{'}$. Applying (4) with $a \in J$ we have $f(a) = 0$ for all $a \in J$, a contradiction. This completes the proof. $\square$

The main purpose of the present paper is to investigate the transcendence of T in the case that $m = 4$, that is

$$T = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha n^2 + \beta n + \gamma}{(qn + r_1)(qn + r_2)(qn + r_3)(qn + r_4)} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \{ \frac{A_1}{qn + r_1} + \frac{A_2}{qn + r_2} + \frac{A_3}{qn + r_3} + \frac{A_4}{qn + r_4} \},$$

and $f(n)$ is a periodic function with period q taking only four non-zero values $f(r_1) = A_1, f(r_2) = A_2, f(r_3) = A_3, f(r_4) = A_4$ satisfying

$$f(r_1) + f(r_2) + f(r_3) + f(r_4) = 0 \text{ and } T = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(n)}{n} = 0.$$

We divide the proof of Theorem 1.1 into four cases depending on the number ρ of elements of $\{r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4\}$ which are coprime to q. By Proposition 3.1, we have $\rho \leq 3$. First suppose that $\rho = 3$, then without loss of generality we may assume that $\gcd(r_1, q) > 1$ and $\gcd(r_2 r_3 r_4, q) = 1$. If $p | \gcd(r_1, q)$ and $p \nmid r_i$, $i = 2, 3, 4$, then by (5) we get $f(r_1)\varepsilon(r_1, p) = 0$, and so $f(r_1) = 0$ since $\varepsilon(r_1, p) \neq 0$, a contradiction. Consequently if $T = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha n^2 + \beta n + \gamma}{(qn + r_1)(qn + r_2)(qn + r_3)(qn + r_4)} = 0$ and there exists an integer $r \in \{r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4\}$ with $\gcd(r, q) > 1$, then there exists at least another integer $s \in \{r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4\} \backslash \{r\}$ with $\gcd(r, s, q) > 1$.

Now suppose $\rho = 2$. We have

Proposition 3.2 *Suppose*

$$T = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha n^2 + \beta n + \gamma}{(qn + r_1)(qn + r_2)(qn + r_3)(qn + r_4)} = 0,$$

where r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4 *are distinct positive integers* $\leq q$ *and* $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$. *Suppose* $\gcd(\alpha n^2 + \beta n + \gamma, (qn + r_1)(qn + r_2)(qn + r_3)(qn + r_4)) = 1$, $\gcd(r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, q) = 1$ *and* Φ_q *is irreducible over* $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$. *Suppose* $\rho = 2$. *Then* T *is transcendental except when*

$$T = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{16n^2 + 12n - 1}{(4n + 1)(4n + 2)(4n + 3)(4n + 4)}$$

or

$$T = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{36n^2 + 36n - 1}{(6n + 1)(6n + 2)(6n + 4)(6n + 5)}.$$

Proof. Suppose $\rho = 2$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\gcd(r_1, q) > 1$, $\gcd(r_2, q) > 1$ and $\gcd(r_3 r_4, q) = 1$. By the above arguments, we have $\gcd(r_1, r_2, q) = d > 1$.

If $\varphi(d) > 2$, we let

$$a_i \equiv r_3 + i \cdot \frac{q}{d} \pmod q,\ 0 < a_i \le q,\ i = 0, 1, \cdots, d-1.$$

By Lemma 2.3, there are precisely $\varphi(n)/\varphi(n/d) \ge \varphi(d)$ numbers in $\{a_0, a_1, \cdots, a_{d-1}\}$ which are coprime to q. Since $\varphi(d) > 2$, there exist distinct a_{i_0}, a_{j_0} such that $a_{i_0} \ne r_3$, $a_{j_0} \ne r_3$, and $\gcd(a_{i_0}, q) = \gcd(a_{j_0}, q) = 1$. Applying (6) with $a = r_3$, $a = a_{i_0}$ and $a = a_{j_0}$, we get

$$\sum_{m \in M} \frac{f(r_3 m)}{m} = f(r_3) + \sum_{\substack{r_3 m \equiv r_1 \pmod q \\ m \in M}} \frac{f(r_1)}{m} + \sum_{\substack{r_3 m \equiv r_2 \pmod q \\ m \in M}} \frac{f(r_2)}{m} = 0,$$

$$\sum_{m \in M} \frac{f(a_{i_0} m)}{m} = f(a_{i_0}) + \sum_{\substack{a_{i_0} m \equiv r_1 \pmod q \\ m \in M}} \frac{f(r_1)}{m} + \sum_{\substack{a_{i_0} m \equiv r_2 \pmod q \\ m \in M}} \frac{f(r_2)}{m} = 0,$$

$$\sum_{m \in M} \frac{f(a_{j_0} m)}{m} = f(a_{j_0}) + \sum_{\substack{a_{j_0} m \equiv r_1 \pmod q \\ m \in M}} \frac{f(r_1)}{m} + \sum_{\substack{a_{j_0} m \equiv r_2 \pmod q \\ m \in M}} \frac{f(r_2)}{m} = 0.$$

Observe that for every $m \in M$, we have

$$r_3 m \equiv r_i \pmod q \Longleftrightarrow a_{i_0} m \equiv r_i \pmod q \Longleftrightarrow a_{j_0} m \equiv r_i \pmod q, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

It follows that $f(r_3) = f(a_{i_0}) = f(a_{j_0}) \ne 0$, which contradicts to our assumptions.

Now we consider the case $\varphi(d) \le 2$, that is $d = 2, 3, 4, 6$.

Case 1. $d = 2$. First we consider the subcase of $2 \| q$. If $2 \| q$, we choose u_0 to be the smallest positive integer such that $2^{u_0} \equiv 1 \pmod{\frac{q}{2}}$. It is easy to see that $\varepsilon(r_1, 2) = \varepsilon(r_2, 2) = 2$, applying (5) with $p = 2$, we get

$$f(r_1) + f(r_2) = 0. \tag{7}$$

Now we prove the following Claim:

Claim: If there are positive integers k and $c \in J$ such that $r_1 \equiv 2^k c \pmod q$, then $f(c) \ne 0$.

Otherwise, if $f(c) = 0$, applying (6) with $a = c$ we have

$$\sum_{m \in M} \frac{f(cm)}{m} = \sum_{\substack{cm \equiv r_1 \pmod q \\ m \in M}} \frac{f(r_1)}{m} + \sum_{\substack{cm \equiv r_2 \pmod q \\ m \in M}} \frac{f(r_2)}{m} = 0. \tag{8}$$

Since $\gcd(r_1, r_2, q) = 2$, then $cm \equiv r_i \pmod{q}$, $i = 1, 2$ can occur only when $m = 2^x$ for some positive integer x. If the congruence $r_2 \equiv 2^x c \pmod{q}$ has no solution x, then by (8), we have

$$f(r_1) \sum_{\substack{cm \equiv r_1 \pmod{q} \\ m \in M}} \frac{1}{m} = 0,$$

and so $f(r_1) = 0$, a contradiction. If the congruence $r_2 \equiv 2^x c \pmod{q}$ has solutions, we take l to be the smallest positive integer solution, then all positive solutions can be expressed as $l + tu_0$, $t = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$. Let k_0 be the smallest positive integer solution of the congruence $r_1 \equiv 2^k c \pmod{q}$. Then (8) becomes

$$\frac{f(r_1)}{2^{k_0}} \frac{1}{1 - 2^{-u_0}} + \frac{f(r_2)}{2^l} \frac{1}{1 - 2^{-u_0}} = 0. \tag{9}$$

Combining (7) and (9), we get $k_0 = l$, which implies that $r_1 \equiv r_2 \pmod{q}$, a contradiction. We have proved the Claim.

For given positive integers n, a, and i with $\gcd(a, q) = 1$, since $2 \| q$, then the congruence $2^n a \equiv 2^i x_i \pmod{q}$ has precisely one solution x_i such that $0 < x_i < q$ and $\gcd(x_i, q) = 1$. On the other hand, if $1 \le i < j \le u_0$, then $x_i \ne x_j$. Indeed, if $2^i x_i \equiv 2^j x_i \equiv 2^n a \pmod{q}$, it follows that $2^{j-i} \equiv 1 \pmod{\frac{q}{2}}$, $u_0 | j - i$, a contradiction. Let $r_1 = 2^k R_1$, $r_2 = 2^l R_2$, where k, l, R_1, R_2 are positive integers and $\gcd(R_1 R_2, q) = 1$. Let x_i be the unique solution of congruence

$$2^k R_1 \equiv 2^i x_i \pmod{q}, \ 0 < x_i < q, \ \gcd(x_i, q) = 1, \ i = 1, 2, \cdots, u_0.$$

By the Claim and the above arguments we have $f(x_i) \ne 0$, $i = 1, 2, \cdots, u_0$, $\gcd(x_i, q) = 1$ and $x_i \ne x_j$ $(i \ne j)$, and so $u_0 \le 2$ since we have $f(x) = 0$ for $x \in J \backslash \{r_3, r_4\}$. If $u_0 = 1$, then $q = 2$, a contradiction. If $u_0 = 2$, then $q = 6$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $r_1 = 2, r_2 = 4, r_3 = 1, r_4 = 5$. Applying (5) with $p = 2$ and (6) with $a = r_3$ and $a = r_4$, we have

$$\begin{cases} f(r_1) + f(r_2) = 0, \\ f(r_3) + \frac{f(r_1)}{2} \frac{1}{1-2^{-2}} + \frac{f(r_2)}{4} \frac{1}{1-2^{-2}} = 0, \\ f(r_4) + \frac{f(r_1)}{4} \frac{1}{1-2^{-2}} + \frac{f(r_2)}{2} \frac{1}{1-2^{-2}} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Hence

$$f(r_2) = -f(r_1), f(r_3) = -\frac{1}{3} f(r_1), f(r_4) = \frac{1}{3} f(r_1).$$

By Lemma 2.1 we get

$$T = \frac{1}{3} f(r_1) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \{ \frac{3}{6n+2} - \frac{3}{6n+4} - \frac{1}{6n+1} + \frac{1}{6n+5} \}$$

$$= \frac{2}{3} f(r_1) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{36n^2+36n-1}{(6n+1)(6n+2)(6n+4)(6n+5)} = 0.$$

Next we consider the case that $q = 4$, without loss of generality we may assume that $r_1 = 2, r_2 = 4, r_3 = 1, r_4 = 3$. Applying (5) with $p = 2$ and (6) with $a = r_3$ and $a = r_4$, we have

$$\begin{cases} f(r_1) + 3f(r_2) = 0, \\ f(r_3) + \frac{f(r_1)}{2} + \frac{f(r_2)}{4}\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{2}} = 0, \\ f(r_4) + \frac{f(r_1)}{2} + \frac{f(r_2)}{4}\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{2}} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Hence

$$f(r_1) = -3f(r_2), f(r_3) = f(r_2), f(r_4) = f(r_2).$$

By Lemma 2.1 we have

$$T = f(r_2) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \{ \frac{-3}{4n+2} + \frac{1}{4n+4} + \frac{1}{4n+1} + \frac{1}{4n+3} \}$$

$$= f(r_2) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{16n^2+12n-1}{(4n+1)(4n+2)(4n+3)(4n+4)} = 0.$$

Now we deal with the case $4|q$ and $q > 4$. Since $d = \gcd(r_1, r_2, q) = 2$, $4|q$, without loss of generality we may assume that $q = 2^{\alpha_0}Q$, $r_1 = 2R_1$, and $r_2 = 2^l R_2$, where Q, l, R_1, R_2, α_0 are positive integers, $\alpha_0 \geq 2$, $2 \nmid Q$, $l \geq 1$ and $\gcd(R_1R_2, q) = 1$. Let

$$a_i \equiv r_3 + i \cdot \frac{q}{2} \pmod{q}, \ 0 < a_i \leq q, \ i = 0, 1.$$

Since $4|q$, then $\gcd(a_0a_1, q) = 1$. Note that

$$\{m \in M | \ ma_0 \equiv r_i \pmod{q}\} = \{m \in M | \ ma_1 \equiv r_i \pmod{q}\}, \ i = 1, 2.$$

Applying (6) with $a = a_0$ and $a = a_1$ we get

$$f(a_0) = f(a_1).$$

Since $a_0 = r_3$ and $f(x) = 0$ for $x \in J \backslash \{r_3, r_4\}$, we have $a_1 = r_4$ and $f(r_3) = f(r_4)$. Note that

$$M_1 = \{m \in M | \ R_1 m \equiv r_1 = 2R_1 \pmod{q}\} = \{2\}$$

and

$$M_2 = \{m \in M | \ R_1 m \equiv r_2 \pmod{q}\} = \{2^n \in M | \ R_1 2^n \equiv r_2 \pmod{q}\}.$$

If the congruence $r_2 \equiv 2^x R_1 \pmod{q}$ has no solution, then by applying (6) with $a = R_1$ we get $f(R_1) + \frac{f(r_1)}{2} = 0$, and so $f(R_1) = -\frac{f(r_1)}{2} \neq 0$, it follows that

$f(R_1) = f(r_4) = f(r_3) = -\frac{f(r_1)}{2}$. Since $f(r_1) + f(r_2) + f(r_3) + f(r_4) = 0$, so $f(r_2) = 0$, a contradiction. Now we assume that $l^{'}$ is the smallest positive solution of the congruence $r_2 \equiv 2^x R_1 \pmod{q}$. Let u_0 be the smallest positive integer such that $2^{u_0} \equiv 1 \pmod{Q}$. We consider the following four subcases.

(i) If $f(R_1) = 0$ and $l \geq \alpha_0$. Applying (5) with $p = 2$ and (6) with $a = R_1$, we get

$$\begin{cases} f(r_1) + (\alpha_0 + 1) f(r_2) = 0, \\ \frac{f(r_1)}{2} + \frac{f(r_2)}{2^{l^{'}}} \frac{1}{1-2^{-u_0}} = 0, \end{cases}$$

then $\alpha_0 + 1 = \frac{2^{u_0 - l^{'} + 1}}{2^{u_0} - 1}$, and so $\alpha_0 = l^{'} = u_0 = 1$, a contradiction.

(ii) If $f(R_1) = 0$ and $l < \alpha_0$, then $l = l^{'}$ and $M_2 = \{2^{l^{'}}\}$. Applying (5) with $p = 2$ and (6) with $a = R_1$, we get

$$\begin{cases} f(r_1) + l f(r_2) = 0, \\ \frac{f(r_1)}{2} + \frac{f(r_2)}{2^{l^{'}}} = 0, \end{cases}$$

then $l = \frac{1}{2^{l^{'}-1}}$, and so $l = l^{'} = 1$ and $r_2 \equiv 2R_1 \equiv r_1 \pmod{q}$, a contradiction.

(iii) If $f(R_1) \neq 0$ and $l \geq \alpha_0$. Similarly, we have

$$\begin{cases} f(r_3) = f(r_4), \\ f(r_1) + (\alpha_0 + 1) f(r_2) = 0, \\ f(r_1) + f(r_2) + f(r_3) + f(r_4) = 0, \\ f(r_3) + \frac{f(r_1)}{2} + \frac{f(r_2)}{2^{l^{'}}} \frac{1}{1-2^{-u_0}} = 0, \end{cases}$$

then $2^{l^{'}-1}(1 - 2^{-u_0}) = 1$, and so $u_0 = 1, l^{'} = 2, q = 4$, a contradiction.

(iv) If $f(R_1) \neq 0$ and $l < \alpha_0$, then $M_1 = \{2\}$ and $M_2 = \{2^{l^{'}}\}$. Similarly, we have

$$\begin{cases} f(r_3) = f(r_4), \\ f(r_1) + l f(r_2) = 0, \\ f(r_1) + f(r_2) + f(r_3) + f(r_4) = 0, \\ f(r_3) + \frac{f(r_1)}{2} + \frac{f(r_2)}{2^{l^{'}}} = 0, \end{cases}$$

then $2^{l^{'}} = 2$, $l^{'} = 1$, $l = l^{'} = 1$ by the definition of l and $l^{'}$, and so $r_2 \equiv 2R_1 = r_1 \pmod{q}$, again a contradiction.

Case 2. $d = 3$. Let

$$a_j \equiv r_3 + j\frac{q}{3} \pmod{q}, \ 0 < a_j \leq q, \ j = 0, 1, 2,$$

and let

$$M_{ij} = \{m \in M \mid m a_j \equiv r_i \pmod{q}\}, \ i = 1, 2, \ j = 0, 1, 2.$$

If $9|q$, then

$$M_{10} = M_{11} = M_{12},\ M_{20} = M_{21} = M_{22}.$$

Applying (6) with $a = a_0, a_1$ and a_2, we have

$$f(r_3) = f(a_0) = f(a_1) = f(a_2),$$

and a_0, a_1, a_2 are distinct, which contradicts to the fact that $f(x) = 0$ for $x \in J\backslash\{r_3, r_4\}$.

If $3\|q$, then by Lemma 2.3 we can choose $a_{j_0} \in \{a_1, a_2\}$ such that $\gcd(a_{j_0}, q) = 1$. Similarly, we have

$$f(a_0) = f(a_{j_0}),$$

so $a_{j_0} = r_4$ and $f(r_3) = f(r_4)$. Applying (5) with $p = 3$, we get $f(r_1)+f(r_2) = 0$. Combining with $f(r_3) = f(r_4)$, $f(r_1)+f(r_2)+f(r_3)+f(r_4) = 0$, we have $f(r_3) = 0$, a contradiction.

The cases $d = 4$ and $d = 6$ are similar to $d = 3$, and we omit the details. This completes the proof. $\square$

Proposition 3.3 *Suppose that*

$$T = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha n^2 + \beta n + \gamma}{(qn + r_1)(qn + r_2)(qn + r_3)(qn + r_4)} = 0,$$

where r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4 *are distinct positive integers* $\leq q$ *and* $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$. *Suppose* $\gcd(\alpha n^2+\beta n+\gamma, (qn+r_1)(qn+r_2)(qn+r_3)(qn+r_4)) = 1$, $\gcd(r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, q) = 1$ *and* Φ_q *is irreducible over* $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$. *Then* $\rho \neq 1$.

Proof. Suppose $\rho = 1$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\gcd(r_i, q) > 1$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, and $\gcd(r_4, q) = 1$.

First we consider the case that there exist distinct integers $r_i, r_j \in \{r_1, r_2, r_3\}$, such that $\varphi(\gcd(r_i, r_j, q)) > 1$, say $\varphi(\gcd(r_2, r_3, q)) > 1$. Let

$$a_i = 1 + i \cdot \frac{q}{\gcd(r_2, r_3, q)},\ i = 0, 1, \cdots, \gcd(r_2, r_3, q) - 1.$$

By Lemma 2.3, we may choose a_{i_0} such that $a_{i_0} \neq 1$ and $\gcd(a_{i_0}, q) = 1$. Applying Lemma 2.2 with $k = a_{i_0}$, we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(a_{i_0} n)}{n} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \{\frac{f(r_1)}{nq + r_1^{'}} + \frac{f(r_2)}{nq + r_2} + \frac{f(r_3)}{nq + r_3} + \frac{f(r_4)}{nq + r_4^{'}}\} = 0, \tag{10}$$

where $r_1^{'} \equiv a_{i_0}^{-1} r_1$, $r_4^{'} \equiv a_{i_0}^{-1} r_4 \pmod q$ and $0 < r_1^{'}, r_4^{'} < q$. Obviously $r_4 \neq r_4^{'}$ since $a_{i_0} \not\equiv 1 \pmod q$ and $\gcd(r_4, q) = 1$. Subtracting T from (10), we obtain

$$T^{'} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \{\frac{f(r_1)}{nq + r_1^{'}} - \frac{f(r_1)}{nq + r_1} + \frac{f(r_4)}{nq + r_4^{'}} - \frac{f(r_4)}{nq + r_4}\} = 0.$$

If $r_1 = r_1^{'}$, then $T^{'} = f(r_4)\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\{\frac{1}{r_4^{'}} - \frac{1}{r_4}\} \neq 0$, a contradiction. If $r_1 \neq r_1^{'}$, then there are precisely two integers $r_4, r_4^{'}$ in $\{r_1, r_1^{'}, r_4, r_4^{'}\}$ which are coprime to q. By Proposition 3.2 we have

$$T^{'} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\{\frac{-3}{4n+2} + \frac{1}{4n+4} + \frac{1}{4n+1} + \frac{1}{4n+3}\}, \quad q = 4,$$

or

$$T^{'} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\{\frac{3}{6n+2} + \frac{-3}{6n+4} + \frac{-1}{6n+1} + \frac{1}{6n+5}\}, \ q = 6.$$

The first equality is impossible since $q > 4$. If the second equality holds, then $q = 6$, $\{r_2, r_3\} = \{3, 6\}$ and $3 \not| r_1$. Applying (5) with $p = 3$, we get $f(r_2)+f(r_3) = 0$, which implies that $f(r_1) + f(r_4) = 0$. But in the second equality we have $f(r_1) = 3f(r_4)$ or $f(r_1) = -3f(r_4)$, a contradiction.

Now we assume that $\varphi(\gcd(r_i, r_j, q)) \leq 1$ for all distinct integers $r_i, r_j \in \{r_1, r_2, r_3\}$, then $\gcd(r_1, r_2, q) = \gcd(r_1, r_3, q) = \gcd(r_2, r_3, q) = 2$.

(i) If $2\|q$, then applying (5) with $p = 2$, we have $f(r_1) + f(r_2) + f(r_3) = 0$, and so $f(r_4) = 0$, a contradiction.

(ii) If $4|q$, let $a_1 = 1 + \frac{q}{2}$, then $a_1 \neq 1$, $\gcd(a_1, q) = 1$, and $a_1 r_i \equiv r_i \pmod q$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. Applying Lemma 2.2 with $k = a_1$, we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{f(a_1 n)}{n} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\{\frac{f(r_1)}{nq+r_1} + \frac{f(r_2)}{nq+r_2} + \frac{f(r_3)}{nq+r_3} + \frac{f(r_4)}{nq+r_4^{'}}\} = 0, \tag{11}$$

where $r_4^{'} \equiv r_4 + \frac{q}{2} \pmod q$ and $0 < r_4^{'} < q$. Subtracting T from (11), we obtain $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\{\frac{f(r_4)}{nq+r_4^{'}} - \frac{f(r_4)}{nq+r_4}\} = 0$, which contradicts to $r_4^{'} \neq r_4$. The proof is complete. □

Proposition 3.4 *Suppose that*

$$T = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{\alpha n^2 + \beta n + \gamma}{(qn+r_1)(qn+r_2)(qn+r_3)(qn+r_4)} = 0,$$

where r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4 *are distinct positive integers* $\leq q$ *, and* $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$*. Suppose* $\gcd(\alpha n^2+\beta n+\gamma, (qn+r_1)(qn+r_2)(qn+r_3)(qn+r_4)) = 1$, $\gcd(r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, q) = 1$ *and* Φ_q *is irreducible over* $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$*. Then* $\rho \neq 0$*.*

Proof. Suppose $\rho = 0$. We divide the proof into two cases.

Case 1. There exist distinct integers $r_i, r_j, r_k \in \{r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4\}$ such that $\gcd(r_i, r_j, r_k, q) > 1$, say, $d = \gcd(r_1, r_2, r_3, q) > 1$. Let

$$a_i = 1 + i \cdot \frac{q}{d}, \ i = 0, 1, \cdots, d-1.$$

If $\varphi(d) > 1$, we may choose $a_{i_0} \in \{a_0, a_1, \cdots, a_{d-1}\}$ such that $a_{i_0} \neq 1$ and $a_{i_0} \in J$ by Lemma 2.3. Note that

$$a_{i_0} r_j \equiv r_j \pmod q, \ j = 1, 2, 3.$$

Applying Lemma 2.2 with $k = a_{i_0}$, we obtain

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(a_{i_0} n)}{n} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \{\frac{f(r_1)}{nq + r_1} + \frac{f(r_2)}{nq + r_2} + \frac{f(r_3)}{nq + r_3} + \frac{f(r_4)}{nq + r_4^{'}}\} = 0, \tag{12}$$

where $r_4^{'} \equiv a_{i_0}^{-1} r_4 \pmod q$ and $0 < r_4^{'} < q$. It is easy to check that $r_4 \neq r_4^{'}$ since $\gcd(r_4, d, q) = 1$. Subtracting the second equality of (12) from T, we have $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \{\frac{f(r_4)}{nq+r_4} - \frac{f(r_4)}{nq+r_4^{'}}\} = 0$, which is impossible since $r_4 \neq r_4^{'}$.

If $\varphi(d) = 1$, then $d = 2 = \gcd(r_1, r_2, r_3, q)$.

(i) If $2 \| q$, applying (5) with $p = 2$ we get $f(r_1) + f(r_2) + f(r_3) = 0$, and so $f(r_4) = 0$, a contradiction.

(ii) If $4 | q$, we take $b_1 = 1 + \frac{q}{2}$, then $\gcd(b_1, q) = 1$, and $b_1 r_i \equiv r_i \pmod q$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. Applying (6) with $a = b_1$ we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(b_1 n)}{n} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \{\frac{f(r_1)}{nq + r_1} + \frac{f(r_2)}{nq + r_2} + \frac{f(r_3)}{nq + r_3} + \frac{f(r_4)}{nq + r_4^{'}}\} = 0,$$

where $r_4^{'} \equiv b_1^{-1} r_4 \pmod q$ and $0 < r_4^{'} < q$. Similarly, $r_4^{'} \neq r_4$. Subtracting the above second equality from T, we obtain $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \{\frac{f(r_4)}{nq+r_4} - \frac{f(r_4)}{nq+r_4^{'}}\} = 0$, which is also impossible since $r_4 \neq r_4^{'}$.

Case 2. If $\gcd(r_i, r_j, r_k, q) = 1$ for all distinct $r_i, r_j, r_k \in \{r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4\}$, then there exist distinct $r_i, r_j \in \{r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4\}$ such that $\varphi(\gcd(r_i, r_j, q)) > 1$, say, $\varphi(\gcd(r_1, r_2, q)) > 1$. Otherwise, we would have $gcd(r_i, r_j, q) = 1$ or 2 for all distinct $r_i, r_j \in \{r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4\}$, and it would follow that $\gcd(r_1, q) \gcd(r_2, q) \gcd(r_3, q) \gcd(r_4, q)$ has only one prime divisor 2 by the argument of the paragraph above Proposition 3.2, and this would mean that $\gcd(r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, q) = 2$ since $\rho = 0$, contradicting our assumptions. Let

$$c_i = 1 + i \cdot \frac{q}{\gcd(r_1, r_2, q)}, \ i = 0, 1, \cdots, \gcd(r_1, r_2, q) - 1.$$

By Lemma 2.3 we can choose c_{i_0} such that $c_{i_0} \neq 1$ and $\gcd(c_{i_0}, q) = 1$. Note that $c_{i_0} r_j \equiv r_j \pmod q$, $j = 1, 2$. Similarly, applying Lemma 2.2 with $k = c_{i_0}$ and subtracting, we obtain

$$T^{'} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \{\frac{f(r_3)}{nq + r_3} - \frac{f(r_3)}{nq + r_3^{'}} + \frac{f(r_4)}{nq + r_4} - \frac{f(r_4)}{nq + r_4^{'}}\} = 0,$$

where $r_3^{'} \equiv c_{i_0}^{-1} r_3 \pmod q$, $r_4^{'} \equiv c_{i_0}^{-1} r_4 \pmod q$, $0 < r_3^{'}, r_4^{'} < q$. Note that $r_3 \neq r_3^{'}$, $r_4 \neq r_4^{'}$, $\gcd(r_3, q) = \gcd(r_3^{'}, q)$ and $\gcd(r_4, q) = \gcd(r_4^{'}, q)$.

(i) If $\gcd(r_3, r_4, q) = 1$. Since $\gcd(r_3, q) > 1$ and $\gcd(r_4, q) > 1$, without loss of generality, we may assume that $\gcd(r_3, q) > 2$, that is $\varphi(\gcd(r_3, q)) > 1$. Let

$$d_j = 1 + j \cdot \frac{q}{\gcd(r_3, q)},\ j = 0, 1, \cdots, \gcd(r_3, q) - 1.$$

Similarly, we can choose $d_{j_0} \neq 1$ and $\gcd(d_{j_0}, q) = 1$ such that

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \{ \frac{f(r_3)}{nq + r_3} - \frac{f(r_3)}{nq + r_3^{'}} + \frac{f(r_4)}{nq + r_4^{''}} - \frac{f(r_4)}{nq + r_4^{'''}} \} = 0,$$

where $r_4^{''} \equiv d_{j_0}^{-1} r_4 \pmod q$, $r_4^{'''} \equiv d_{j_0}^{-1} r_4^{'} \pmod q$, $0 < r_4^{'}, r_4^{''}, r_4^{'''} < q$. It follows that

$$T^{''} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \{ \frac{f(r_4)}{nq + r_4} - \frac{f(r_4)}{nq + r_4^{'}} - \frac{f(r_4)}{nq + r_4^{''}} + \frac{f(r_4)}{nq + r_4^{'''}} \} = 0.$$

Note that $r_4^{'} \neq r_4^{'''}$, $r_4 \neq r_4^{''}$, $r_4 \neq r_4^{\prime}$, $r_4^{''} \neq r_4^{'''}$ and $\gcd(r_4, q) = \gcd(r_4^{\prime}, q) = \gcd(r_4^{''}, q) = \gcd(r_4^{'''}, q)$ since $\gcd(c_{i_0} d_{j_0}, q) = 1$. Now we have

$$T^{''} = \frac{f(r_4)}{\gcd(r_4, q)} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \{ \frac{1}{nq^{'} + a} + \frac{-1}{nq^{'} + b} + \frac{-1}{nq^{'} + c} + \frac{1}{nq^{'} + e} \} = 0,$$

where $q^{'} = \frac{q}{\gcd(r_4, q)}, a = \frac{r_4}{\gcd(r_4, q)}, b = \frac{r_4^{'}}{\gcd(r_4, q)}, c = \frac{r_4^{''}}{\gcd(r_4, q)}, e = \frac{r_4^{'''}}{\gcd(r_4, q)}$. Obviously all of a, b, c, e are coprime to $q^{'}$ and $\Phi_{q^{'}}$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$.

It is easy to check that a, b, c, e are distinct. Otherwise, since $a \neq b$, $a \neq c$, $c \neq e$, $b \neq e$, we have $a = e$ or $b = c$. If $a = e$ and $b = c$ both hold, then

$$T^{''} = \frac{f(r_4)}{\gcd(r_4, q)} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \{ \frac{2}{nq^{'} + a} + \frac{-2}{nq^{'} + b} \} \neq 0,$$

which is a contradiction. If $a = e$ and $b \neq c$, then by Theorem C we have

$$T^{''} = \frac{f(r_4)}{\gcd(r_4, q)} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \{ \frac{2}{nq^{'} + a} + \frac{-1}{nq^{'} + b} + \frac{-1}{nq^{'} + c} \} \neq 0,$$

which is also a contradiction. Similarly, the case that $a \neq e$ and $b = c$ is impossible. Therefore $T^{''} = 0$ is impossible by Proposition 3.1.

(ii) If $\gcd(r_3, r_4, q) > 1$, applying (5) with some prime p satisfying $p | \gcd(r_3, r_4, q)$, we get

$$v f(r_3) + u f(r_4) = 0,$$

where u, v are positive rational numbers, then we may re-write $T^{'}$ as

$$T^{'} = \frac{f(r_4)}{\gcd(r_3,r_4,q)} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \{ \frac{-\frac{u}{v}}{nq^{'}+a} + \frac{\frac{u}{v}}{nq^{'}+b} + \frac{1}{nq^{'}+c} + \frac{-1}{nq^{'}+e} \},$$

where $q^{'} = \frac{q}{\gcd(r_3,r_4,q)}$, $a = \frac{r_3}{\gcd(r_3,r_4,q)}$, $b = \frac{r_3^{'}}{\gcd(r_3,r_4,q)}$, $c = \frac{r_4}{\gcd(r_3,r_4,q)}$, $e = \frac{r_4^{'}}{\gcd(r_3,r_4,q)}$. It is easy to see that $\gcd(a,q^{'}) = \gcd(b,q^{'})$, $\gcd(c,q^{'}) = \gcd(e,q^{'})$, and $\gcd(a,c,q^{'}) = 1$. Note that $\Phi_{q^{'}}$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$ and a,b,c,e are distinct integers by the same arguments as above.

By Proposition 3.1, we have either $\gcd(a,q^{'}) > 1$ or $\gcd(c,q^{'}) > 1$.

If precisely one of $\gcd(a,q^{'}), \gcd(c,q^{'})$ is 1, then without loss of generality we may assume that $\gcd(c,q^{'}) = 1$ and $\gcd(a,q^{'}) > 1$. Then by Proposition 3.2 we have that

$$T^{'} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \{ \frac{-3}{4n+2} + \frac{1}{4n+4} + \frac{1}{4n+1} + \frac{1}{4n+3} \} = 0, \ q^{'} = 4, \tag{13}$$

or

$$T^{'} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \{ \frac{3}{6n+2} + \frac{-3}{6n+4} + \frac{-1}{6n+1} + \frac{1}{6n+5} \} = 0, \ q^{'} = 6. \tag{14}$$

(13) is impossible since $\{-3,1,1,1\} \neq \{-\frac{hu}{v}, \frac{hu}{v}, h, -h\}$ for all $h \in \mathbb{Q}$. If (14) holds, then $q^{'} = 6$, $\{a,b\} = \{2,4\}$ and $\frac{u}{v} = 3$, that is $q = 6\gcd(r_3,r_4,q)$. Note that $\gcd(r_3,q) = \gcd(r_3,r_4,q)\gcd(a,q')$ and $\gcd(\gcd(r_1,r_2,q), \gcd(r_3,q)) = 1$. It follows that

$$\gcd(r_1,r_2,q)\gcd(a,q^{'})|6.$$

Since $\gcd(a,q^{'}) > 1$ and $\varphi(\gcd(r_1,r_2,q)) > 1$, then $\gcd(a,q^{'}) = 2$ and $\gcd(r_1,r_2,q) = 3$. If $\gcd(r_3,r_4,q) \neq 2$, then $\varphi(\gcd(r_3,r_4,q)) > 1$. Similarly, using the same argument as above we obtain that $\gcd(r_3,r_4,q) = 3$, a contradiction. If $\gcd(r_3,r_4,q) = 2$, then $q = 12$ and $\{r_1,r_2\} = \{3,9\}$. Applying (5) with $p = 3$ we have $f(r_1) + f(r_2) = 0$. It follows that $f(r_3) + f(r_4) = 0$ which contradicts with $f(r_3) = -3f(r_4)$ since $\frac{u}{v} = 3$.

If $\gcd(a,q^{'}) > 1, \gcd(c,q^{'}) > 1$. Since $\gcd(a,c,q^{'}) = 1$, $\gcd(a,q^{'}) = \gcd(b,q^{'})$ and $\gcd(c,q^{'}) = \gcd(e,q^{'})$, then one of $\gcd(a,b,q')$ and $\gcd(c,e,q')$ is larger than 2, say, $\gcd(a,b,q') > 2$. Let

$$l_j = 1 + j \cdot \frac{q'}{\gcd(a,b,q')}, j = 1, \cdots, \frac{q'}{\gcd(a,b,q')} - 1.$$

Similarly, we can choose $l_{j_0} \neq 1$ and $\gcd(l_{j_0}, q') = 1$ such that

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \{ \frac{-\frac{u}{v}}{nq^{'}+a} + \frac{\frac{u}{v}}{nq^{'}+b} + \frac{1}{nq^{'}+c^{'}} + \frac{-1}{nq^{'}+e^{'}} \} = 0,$$

where $c' \equiv l_{j_0}^{-1}c, e' \equiv l_{j_0}^{-1}e$, $0 < c', e' < q'$. It follows that

$$T_1 = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \{ \frac{1}{nq' + c} + \frac{1}{nq' + e'} - \frac{1}{nq' + c'} - \frac{1}{nq' + e} \} = 0,$$

$c \neq c', e \neq e', \gcd(c, q') = \gcd(e, q') = \gcd(c'q') = \gcd(e', q') > 1$. The remaining argument is the same line as in Case 2 (i). This completes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 1.1: By the above propositions 3.1-3.4, we have proven Theorem 1.1.

Acknowledgement: The authors wish to thank the referee for helpful comments on this paper.

References

[1] S.D. Adhikari, *Transcendental Infinite sums and related questions*,Number theory and discrete mathematics, proceedings of conference, Chandigarh, 2000 (Hindustan Book Agency, 2002), 169-178.

[2] S.D. Adhikari, N. Saradha, T.N. Shorey, R. Tijdeman, *Transcendental Infinite Sums*, Indag. Math. (N.S) 12 (2001), 1-14.

[3] A. Baker, B.J. Birch, E.A. Wirsing, *On a problem of Chowla*, J. Number Theory 5 (1973), 224-236.

[4] S. Chowla, *The Riemann zeta and allied functions*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 58 (1952),287-305.

[5] Chao Ko and Qi Sun, Introduction to Number Theory(I) (in Chinese), Higher Education Press, 2001.1, 53-54.

[6] D. H. Lehmer, Euler constants for arithmetical progressions, Acta Arith. 27 (1975), 125-142.

[7] A.E. Livingston, *The series* $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(n)}{n}$ *for periodic* f, Canad. Math. Bull. 8 (1965), 413-432.

[8] T. Okada, *On a certain infinite sums for a periodic arithmetical functions*, Acta Arith.40(1982), 143-153.

[9] N. Saradha, R. Tijdeman,*On the transcendence of infinite sums of values of rational functions*, J. London. Math. Soc.(3) 67 (2003), 580-592.

[10] R. Tijdeman, *Some applications of diophantine approximation*, Number Theory for the Millennium II,Proceedings of conference, Urbana, IL, 2000-Vol. III(A.K. Peters, Natick MA, 2002), 261-284.

[11] R. Tijdeman, *On irrationality and transcendency of infinite sums of rational numbers*, Shorey Proc., to appear.

Pingzhi Yuan
School of Mathematics
South China Normal University
Guangzhou 510631
P.R.CHINA
email:mcsypz@mail.sysu.edu.cn

Juan Li
Department of Mathematics
Sun Yat-sen University
Guangzhou 510275
P.R.CHINA
email:lijuan6@mail2.sysu.edu.cn